

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 have been examined. Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and claims 1-4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Also, the Examiner has indicated that claims 6-12 contain allowable subject matter.

**I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,473,735 to Murakami (“Murakami”).**

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Murakami. However, Applicant submits that claim 5 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, in claim 5, a first memory section stores image data. The stored image data is converted into print data every time execution of print is instructed. Further, a second memory stores the image data (i.e. unconverted data) stored in the first memory after the print data is printed.

On the other hand, referring to column 2, lines 53-54 of Murakami, unconverted print data is stored in a first storage means. The unconverted print data is then converted to dot image data, and a portion of the converted dot image data is stored in the second storage means (col. 2, lines 55-59). The converted dot image data can then be printed to a recording medium (col. 2, lines 59-61). A third storage means is also utilized which stores the converted dot image data prior to a re-printing operation in the event of an incompletely printed page (col. 3, lines 4-6).

As noted above, in claim 5, image data is stored in the first memory section and converted to print data. Since the image data must be converted into print data to be printed, it follows that the image data is unconverted data. As further stated in claim 5, the image data,

which is contained in the first memory section, is stored in the second memory section. As clearly recited in the claim, image data is data that has not been “converted” into print data. Since claim 5 recites that the second memory section stores the image data, then Applicant submits that the second memory section stores “unconverted” data (i.e. image data which is not converted into print data). On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner maintains that there is no mention of the claimed image data being “unconverted” data. However, as disclosed above, Applicant submits that claim 5 adequately discloses that the claimed image data is unconverted data.

On the other hand, in Murakami, unconverted data (i.e. print data) is stored in the first storage means and converted to print data (i.e. dot image data). Then, the converted data is stored in the second storage means and, if a re-printing process is required, a third storage means is utilized to store the converted data.

The Examiner maintains that the claimed second memory section is shown by the third storage means of Murakami. However as stated above, the third storage means stores converted dot image data. Since claim 5 recites that second memory section stores image data (i.e. data that has not been converted into print data), the third storage means of Murakami fails to suggest the second memory section of claim 5.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 5 is patentable over the cited reference.

In addition, the Examiner has indicated that claims 6 and 7 are allowed. Since claims 6 and 7 contain a second memory section which is analogous to the second memory section recited

in claim 5, Applicant submits that claim 5 is patentable for at least similar reasons as claims 6 and 7.

**II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,806,005 to Hull et al (“Hull”) in view of Murakami.**

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hull in view of Murakami.

**A. Claim 1**

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Hull and Murakami suggest the image data printing system of claim 1. However, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. For example, claim 1 contains similar features, i.e. second memory section, as recited in claim 5. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Murakami for analogous reasons as stated above in our discussion of claim 5. In addition, the Hull reference fails to cure the deficient teachings of Murakami.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of the cited references.

**B. Claim 2**

Since claim 2 depends on claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 2 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

**C. Claim 3**

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Hull and Murakami suggest the image data printing method of claim 3. However, Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable over the cited references. For example, claim 3 contains similar features as recited in claim 5, i.e. storing image data in a second memory section. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable over Murakami for analogous reasons as stated above in Applicant's discussion of claim 5. In addition, the Hull reference fails to cure the deficient teachings of Murakami.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable over the combination of the cited references.

**D. Claim 4**

Since claim 4 depends on claim 3, Applicant submits that claim 4 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

**III. Allowable Subject Matter**

As stated above, the Examiner has indicated that claims 6 and 7 are allowed. Further, the Examiner maintains that claims 8-12 contain allowable subject matter, but are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/533,107

**IV. Newly added claims**

Applicant has added claims 13 and 14 to provide more varied protection for the present invention.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Allison M. Bowles Tulino  
Registration No. 48,294

Date: January 2, 2004